DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 500 CS 504 625

AUTHOR Metts, Sandra; Bryan, Glynis
TITLE Politeness: A Conversationalist Indicator of Sex Roles.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association (Chicago, IL, April 12-14, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; Distinctive Features (Language); Females; Higher Education; Identification; *Interpersonal Communication; *Language Styles; Males; *Sex Role; *Social Behavior; Speech Communication; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *Conversation; *Politeness

ABSTRACT

Six casual conversations between university undergraduates were tape recorded and transcribed in an effort to describe the politeness practices of men and women during ordinary conversation. The first stage of analysis involved dividing the transcripts into utterances or units of speech actions. The second stage of analysis involved coding each utterance for politeness features. Findings indicated that the total frequency of politeness features for all speakers combined across the six conversations was 1,442 instances. In contrast to earlier studies, which found that females preferred positive politeness while males demonstrated no preference, the data from this study indicated that males used positive politeness over negative politeness in a ratio of 14 to 1 while females used it in a ratio of 8 to 1. The typical female politeness profile was seen as a collection of communicative behaviors whose function was oriented toward cooperative identity validation. Considerable conversational effort went into establishing, reinforcing, and sharing identities whose dimensions were simultaneously explored and confirmed. By contrast, the male speaker tended to claim common ground through verbal identity markers such as slang, dialect, and address forms. The typical male politeness profile was summarized as a set of communicative behaviors whose primary outcome was efficiency. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED246500

POLITENESS: A CONVERSATIONAL INDICATOR OF SEX ROLES

by

Sandra Metts
Department of Communication
Illinois State University

and

Glynis Bryan
Department of Communication
Illinois State University

Central States Speech Association Convention
Chicago, Illinois
April, 1984

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sandra Metts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 504625

Introduction

Robin Lakoff is one of several theorists who propose the existence of stereotypical, socially learned differences in the speech of men and women. Among the differences which Lakoff (1975) notes is the expectation that women are the more polite of the two sexes. The scope of this expectation, according to Lakoff, exceeds merely proper ("delicate") language and hypercorrect grammar. Women are supposed to be

> repositories of tact and know the right things to say to other people while men carelessly blurt out whatever they are thinking. Women are supposed to be particularly careful to say 'please' and 'thank you' and to uphold the other social conventions. Certainly a woman who fails at these tasks is apt to be in more trouble than a man who does so. (p. 35)

Furthermore, Lakoff argues, while men tend to speak directly and in accordance with Grice's conversational maxims of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner; women tend to speak with reference to the rules of politeness and rely on conversational implicature.

Lakoff's reasoning is that women are, in general, more interested in "interpersonal discovery" than in talk about external matters. This tendency creates a need for

politeness, which in turn expedites the process of interpersonal discovery (p. 74).

Kramer (1974), on the other hand, challenges stereotypical assumptions of female politeness. She warns that what a culture believes to be fact may be intuition and not reflect the reality of actual language practice.

In an effort to provide empirical data for the discussion of gender differences, Shimanoff (1977) analyzed a ten-minute segment of tape-recorded interaction occurring at a receptionist's desk in an academic office. Her results offer minimal support for Lakoff's position, though only indirectly. Shimanoff found that males and females are equally polite, but that they differ on the type of politeness most often used. Females used positive politeness more than negative politeness, while males used both to approximately the same degree. Since positive politeness involves the communicative acts we perform to give attention to a hearer's need to be recognized, approved of, and valued, it may be consistent with and/or entailed in Lakoff's notion of interpersonal discovery.

The present study is another attempt to provide an empirical description of the politeness practices of men and women during ordinary conversation. It benefits from Shimanoff's appraisal of the methodological problems she encountered in her research.

Methodology

Six casual conversations between university undergraduates provided the data. Two conversations were between mixed-sex partners, two were were between same-sex females, and two were between same-sex males. One dyad in each pair were friends and one were strangers.

These combinations allowed us to attend to sociological variables which may affect politeness strategies: social status, sex of partner, and relational history. Brown and Levinson (1978) observed that status plays a role in decisions regarding politeness strategies. Shimanoff (1977) found that status was a powerful variable which confounded sex differences. (In Shimanoff's study, male faculty members expressed a higher social status relative to the female receptionist, while male students expressed a lower social status.). Shimanoff's difficulty controlling for the effects of status encouraged us to investigate interactions between presumably equal status participants. The use of both same-sex and mixed-sex dyads allowed assessment of the influence of partner's sex on politeness patterns. Zimmerman and West (1975) and and McLaughlin, Cody, Kane, and Robey (1981) have found during the investigation of other phenomena that same-sex dyads exhibit behaviors which are different from those of mixed-sex dyads. With regard to politeness in particular, Lakoff (1975) argues that the

cultural stereotype of men being more polite around women than around other men has validity, especially when polite formality is used to exclude/distance women from the comaraderie of the male social structure. Finally, the relational history of a dyad may affect choices of politeness strategies in that the more familiar the dyad, the less likely the members are to employ politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1978; Weinstein, 1974). The use of both friends and strangers allows for comparison of male and female differences when social distance is implicitly less formal as well as implicitly more formal.

Each conversation was tape-recorded and transcribed verbatim. From each conversation approximately a five-minute segment was isolated for analysis. This segment was a composite taken from three points in each conversation: the opening, the closing, and a randomly selected point in the interior of the conversation where a topic was under discussion. Each of these conversational "junctures" orients participants toward different sets of conversational competencies, and possibly, different patterns of politeness as well.

These six conversational segments were analyzed in two stages. The first stage involved dividing the transcripts into utterances, defined for our purposes as sentence-equivalent units of meaning or speech actions. Thus, both

complete and incomplete clauses or phrases might provide intended and unintended information, present a challenge, make a request, initiate a turn, interrupt a turn, repair or signal repair of another utterance and so forth (Labov and Fanshel, 1977). The utterance was selected as the unit of analysis over the turn primarily because Shimanoff (1977) found the latter to be inadequate. Her data indicated that a turn seldom contained a single politeness feature, but typically contained several, often of different types. She concluded that to code politeness at the level of the turn was to lose much of the complexity of the politeness pattern. In the present investigation, the first author designated all utterances prior to their evaluation for politeness features.

The second stage of analysis involved coding each utterance for politeness features. Politeness categories were based on the descriptive schema presented by Brown and Levinson (1978) with the addition of four other categories suggested by the data (see C.4.0, C.4.1, C.4.2, and D.5.0 in Appendix A.). Consistent with Brown and Levinson's conceptualization, the coding system is divided into three parts: positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record. Specific substrategies relevant to each are presented in Appendix A. The best way to explain these substrategies and provide background into which the results may be situated is

to comment briefly on the underpinnings of the Brown and Levinson schema.

According to Brown and Levinson, persons engaged in interaction have two types of "face." Positive face is the desire to have what we value be valued by others; to be recognized and responded to with approval by important others. Negative face is the desire to be unrestricted, unimpeded, independent, and free from imposition. In the pursuit of personal and conversational goals, participants regularly find threats to one's own and other's face an intrinsic part of interaction. As rational agents, participants will avoid doing face threatening acts or seek to minimize their damage. A participant who does not do the face threatening act escapes any potential interactional "dis-ease" caused by face damage, but also risks the inability to achieve some goal. Thus, actors often elect to do a face-threatening act. The act may be performed indirectly, that is, off-record by means of hints and by conversational implicature. The ambiguity inherent in the off-record threat provides both speaker and hearer with face-saving options, but again lessens accessibility to some particular goal. If a speaker chooses to go "on-record" with a face threat s/he may do it "badly, without redressive action" or "with redressive action." In the former circumstance a speaker suspends concern for giving the

addressee face because the speaker has relatively greater power/status, or because the act is minimally threatening ("Do come in."), or because a matter is urgent and efficiency is paramount. This strategy is, according to Brown and Levinson, the most parallel to what Grice presents as the mexims of a cooperative communicator (i.e., relevance, brevity, truthfulness, and orderliness). As an alternative, a speaker may go on record with redressive action which entails strategies designed to "give face" to the addressee and to indicate that face threat was neither intended nor desired. Positive politeness indicates to addressee that his/her wants and personality are known to and appreciated by the speaker. Negative politeness indicates that the speaker intends to impose upon, coerce, or restrain the addressee's freedom as minimally as possible. Where positive politeness is an "approaching" mechanism to indicate, for example, the addressee's inclusion in a group or a friendship, negative politeness is an "avoiding" mechanism to indicate speaker's deference to and respect for addressee's options and right to expect that his/her response is not coerced.

The substrategies presented in Appendix A are summary statments from Brown and Levinson's discussion of specific off-record, and positive and negative politeness techniques. All utterances in the data were coded with regard to this

list, receiving a numeric representation of an appropriate major category and decimalized minor category (e.g., 1.1, 5.11, etc.). If an utterance contained no politeness feature, it was coded 0.

The authors served as coders. Before coding the target conversational segments, the authors did several independent codings of nontarget segments in order to identify conceptual problems among the categories and establish consistnecy in interpretation of recurrent utterance types. For example, minimal responses such as "hm" and "umhm" could conceivably be coded as non-polite utterances. However, at the very least, they indicate some regard for the comments of co-participant and if they are not offered at appropriate transitions their omission would surely constitute a threat to the co-participant's positive face. For these reasons then, minimal turn utterances were coded as 1.1, indicating positive politeness attending to addressee's desire to be valued. More expressive responses such as a sympathetic "oh::" or laughter in response to other's turn were coded as 1.2, or exaggerated attention to addressee's positive face.

By the third time that utterances had been coded independently and discussed, intercoder reliability on positive politeness features had reached .89 and on negative features had reached .83 (Reliability was computed by dividing twice the number of agreements by the total coding

decisions made by both coders: $2M/N_1 + N_2$). At this point, the target segments used to provide the data for the present analysis were coded. Initial coding was done independently and the small number of disagreements were reconciled by reference to Brown and Levinson's discussion.

Results and Discussion

Total frequency of politeness features for all speakers combined across the six conversations was 1,442 instances. Appendix B indicates the distribution of the total frequency among the various substrategies.

Of these 1,442 features, only 9 were classified as off-record. The relative infrequency of off-record devices is perhaps more a function of their nature than their actual occurrence in the data. That is, if a face-threatening act is done off-record, and is not recognized by addressee, there is a good chance the analyst will miss it also. Those instances which were observed were almost interactional conventions, as when one speaker states that the time had come to terminate the conversation and the other participant turns off the tape recorder. A second reason to explain the absence of off-record strategies is that they bear a strong resemblance in surface form to unintentional disfluency and temporary loss of message clarity. To intentionally violate the maxim of manner by being ambiguous, vague, overgeneral-

ized, and not complying an utterance is sometimes difficult to distinguish from involuntary violation, and thus goes unnoticed by a participant and uncoded by an analyst. Finally, several off-record strategies also resemble some of the negative politeness strategies in surface form and purpose. For example, understatement can be off-record, and also function to give deference to addressee and show regard for negative face. Likewise, being ambiguous or vague can also function to hedge an assertion (attending to positive face by avoiding disagreement) or hedge the illocutionary force of a request (reducing imposition to addressee's negative face).

Clearly, the much greater frequency of positive and negative politeness compared to going off-record reflects a tendency for these speakers, at least when status is equal and conversation is casual, to go on record with face-threatening acts while attending to the face needs of coparticipant. In fact, the ratio of positive and negative politeness features to total utterances is .95 (1433/1511). Overall, exhibiting politeness and making an utterance are almost in a one to one ratio, although in actual practice some utterances contain several features while other utterances contain none.

The data also suggest an overwhelming preference among these speakers for positive politeness. Positive politeness

alone accounted for 91 percent of all politeness (1315/1433) while negative features accounted for only 8 percent of the total (118/1433). At least two explanations are available for this preference. These speakers, because of age, education, or general academic environment are relatively more sensitive to the need for acceptance and approval of their peers than to the need for independence of movement, thought, intention, etc. Or these speakers view casual conversation as superficial to the extent that any impositions are minor and momentary, but nonsuperficial to the extent that one's positive face is vulnerable to threat at several levels, as an interactional partner, as a friend, as a fellow student, and so forth. It is possible that both of these explanations play a part in the preference for positive politeness. Additional data taken in nonacademic settings would provide a useful comparison.

Given the conclusion that, as a group, males and females are polite, the question remains whether females are more polite or polite in different ways when compared to males. Table 1 indicates that females use significantly more politeness than do males and are more prone to use negative politeness than males, though by no means to the level of positive politeness. In contrast to Shimanoff's finding that females preferred positive politeness while males demonstrated no preference, these data indicate that

TABLE 1

Summary of Positive-Negative Politeness Per Utterance

	Pos. Pol.	Neg. Pol.	Total
Male	.83	.06	.89
Female	.92	.11	1.03**

**Chi square test of significance, $p < .001$

males use positive politeness over negative politeness in a ratio of 14 to 1 while females use it in a ratio of 8 to 1.

A comparison of politeness patterns for males and females in mixed-sex dyads and same-sex dyads suggests that females retain this basic ratio across both conditions. Males, on the other hand, appear to make adjustments in their politeness strategies when speaking to females or other males. Table 2 indicates that relative to their overall politeness patterns reported in Table 1, males tend to increase positive politeness and decrease negative politeness when interacting with females. When interacting with other males, these speakers tend to decrease their positive politeness while increasing their negative politeness. Females vary insignificantly, showing a very slight increase

TABLE 2
Summary of Positive-Negative
Politeness Per Utterance
In Same- and Mixed-Sex Dyads

	Pos. Pol.	Neg. Pol.	Total
Male			
Mixed-Sex	.89	.03	.92
Same-Sex	.79	.08	.87
Female			
Mixed-Sex	.92	.12	1.05
Same-Sex	.92	.10	1.02

in negative politeness with male partners and a very slight decrease in negative politeness with female partners. This pattern is open to several possible interpretations. (1) Male speakers may be reluctant to impose upon or restrain female partners, but be less reluctant to do so with male partners. (2) Male speakers may actually perform face-threatening acts during the course of interaction with a female partner but feel relatively less obligation to redress negative face threat with the typical polite forms of deference and formality. (3) Male speakers may be more sensitive to the positive face of a female partner or correspondingly less sensitive to the positive face of a male partner. (4) A male speaker may actually be more willing to go on record with threats to a female partner's positive face causing the relatively greater instance of positive politeness in mixed-sex dyads. Unfortunately, as-

sessing the validity of each interpretation is not possible given the limitations of the coding system used for this analysis. Only potential face threats accompanied by politeness features entered the data set; face threats without redressive action were not coded. Future analysis would benefit from a comparison of acts with redressive action and those without, particularly as a means to rule out competing explanations like those just mentioned.

Two observations have now been made. First, females appear to use more politeness than males and relatively more negative politeness. Second, female politeness tends to be less influenced by the sex of an interactional partner than is male politeness. Moving the level of analysis to specific substrategies provides evidence in support of a final observation: Males and females appear to have characteristic preferences in the selection of face-saving strategies, preferences which are highly consistent with stereotypical (folklinguistic) views of male and female speech.

A rank ordering of the seven most frequently used substrategies reveals that all fall within the more global strategy for giving positive face called "Claiming Common Ground." Table 3 lists these substrategies, their absolute frequencies, and ratio per utterance for males and females.

TABLE 3
Seven Rank-Ordered Substrategies

Numeric Code	Substrategy	*Total Freq.	Ratio/ Utter. Male	Ratio/ Utter Female
1.1	Notice, attend to H's interests, wants, needs, conversational presence	240	.14	.19
1.64	Avoid disagreement: hedge opinions and assertions (sort of)	207	.10	.17
1.43	Use of in-group identity markers: slang and jargon	141	.12	.06
1.734	Assert common ground by presupposing H's knowledge	89	.08	.03
1.2	Exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with H	82	.03	.09
1.33	Intensify interest to H through narrative: exaggerate facts for dramatic effect	79	.05	.05
1.724	Avoid adjusting H's point of view	55	.03	.07

*Frequencies for all substrategies are listed in Appendix B.

The distributions shown in Table 3 provide an intital indication of patterns which continue throughout the substrategies. Female speakers demonstrate a higher level of attention to co-participant's basic needs and values (1.1) by responding with signs of agreement and support and by exaggerating approval and sympathy (1.2). Female speakers show significantly greater preference for taking the role of other (1.721, 1.722) and for allowing the other's

point of view to stand without adjustment, ever if it entails some loss of clarity (1.724). If female speakers want to disagree with a prior statement, they tend to preface the act with a partial agreement in order to mitigate face damage (1.61). Female speakers linguistically hedge on the directness of assertions (1.64) and paralinguistically hedge on the illocutionary force of a request or question (5.12 and 6.2). The typical female politeness profile can be summarized as a collection of communicative behaviors whose function is oriented toward cooperative identity validation; considerable conversational effort goes into establishing, reinforcing, and sharing identities whose dimensions are simultaneously explored (face-threats) and confirmed (politeness). This profile is strong support for Lakoff's (1975) notion of the indirect, interpersonally focused female communicator.

By contrast, the male speaker demonstrates different and much less variable preferences. The male speaker tends to claim common ground with hearer less through expressions of interest, sympathy, or approval and more through verbal identity markers such as slang, dialect, and address forms (1.43, 1.42, 1.41). The male speaker depends heavily on presumptive knowledge of hearer and hearer's values, attitudes, etc. (1.731, 1.732, 1.733, 1.734, 2.1, 2.4). The male speaker tends to notice conversational mechanisms like turn transition signals (C.4.1, C.4.2). The typical male politeness profile can be summarized as a set of communicative behaviors whose primary outcome is efficiency. Male speakers do tend to be more direct than female speakers (the ratio of male indirect features to female indirect features is .12/.16), but more characteristic of their politeness is a focus on information rather than involvement of the source.

Summary

We have presented the patterns of politeness evident within portions of six conversations. In general we found female speakers to be more polite and to be polite in ways reflecting the stereotypical interpersonal orientation proposed by Lakoff.

References

Brown, P & Levinson, S. Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. N. Goody (Ed.) Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Grice, H. P. Logic and conversation. In D. Davidson and G. Harman (Eds.), The logic of grammar, Encino, CA: Dickinson Publishing Company, 1975.

Kramer, Cheris. Folklinguistics. Psychology Today, 1974, 8, 82-85.

Labov, W. & Fanshel, D. Therapeutic discourse. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Lakoff, R. Language and women's place. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

McLaughlin, M. L., Cody, M. J., Kane, M. L., & Roby, C. S. Sex differences in story receipt and story sequencing behaviors in dyadic conversations. Human Communication Research, 1981, 7, 99-116.

Chimanoff, S. B. Investigating politeness, In E. O. Keenan & T. L. Bennett (Eds.) Discourse across time and space, Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 1977, 213-241.

Weinstein, E. Toward a theory of interpersonal tactics. In C. Backman & P. Secord (Eds.), Problems in social psychology, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Zimmerman, D. H. & West, C. Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation. In B. Thorne & N. Henley (Eds.), Language and sex: Differences and dominance, Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1975.

APPENDIX A
Coding Scheme

POSITIVE POLITENESS

1.0 Claim Common Ground

1.1 Notice, attend to H (interests, wants, needs, goods, conversational presence)

1.2 Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H — e.g., oh::, m::, laughing)

1.3 Intensify interest to H (use of narrative and vivid present)

1.31 vivid present ("I says. . ."; "He goes. . .")

1.32 direct dialogue

1.33 overstating or exaggerating) "a million"

1.34 tag questions that draw listener in ("Ya know what I mean?"; "Can you believe that?")

1.4 Use of in-group identity markers

1.41 address forms (informal and/or intimate to soften request)

1.42 in-group language or dialect (code-switching)

1.43 jargon or slang

1.44 contraction and ellipsis (relative to previous turn, not one's own)

1.5 Seek agreement

1.51 safe topics (weather, sports, movies, or other topics appropriate to the relationship)

1.52 repetition of what other has said (especially emotional indicator)

1.6 Avoid disagreement

1.61 token agreement (the "yes, but" pattern)

1.611 displaced answers to questions (rather

than follow directly, answer is delayed ("Ya comin' down early?" /"Well, I don' know. I got a lot to do, but I'll try."))

1.62 pseudo-agreement (referring to a fake agreement—"See you soon, then.")

1.63 white lies

1.64 hedging opinions and assertions (sort of, kind of, well)

1.7 Presuppose/raise/assert common ground

1.71 gossip, small talk (usually before request)

1.72 point of view operations (taking the role of other)

1.721 personal-center switch: S to H. (S speaks as if H were S—e.g., "I had a hard time learning to drive, didn't I?" Or when giving empathy, one asserts what only H can know--e.g., "Yes, it hurts terribly, I know.")

1.722 time switch (vivid-historical present to increase immediacy)

1.723 place switch (use of proximal rather than distal demonstratives as this and here or come versus go to convey participation)

1.724 avoidance of adjustment of reports from H's point of view (assuming that H's point of view is S's or S's is H's —e.g., a preference for direct quotes with uninterpreted referring expressions, general and obvious agreement)

1.73 presupposition manipulations (presuming to know H's needs and wants)

1.731 presuppose knowledge of H's wants and attitudes (". . .wouldn't you?")

1.732 presuppose H's values are the same as S's values (same definition of scale

and criteria for judgement)

1.733 presuppose familiarity in S-H relationship (by terms of address or explicit statement)

1.734 presuppose H's knowledge (presumption may be based on relational and/or discourse history)

1.8 Joke, humor

2.0 Convey that S and H are cooperators

2.1 Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants

2.2 Offer, promise (whatever H wants, S wants <u>for</u> H and will help to obtain——e.g., "I'll drop by sometime next week.")

2.3 Be optimistic (S assumes that H wants S's wants for S, or for S and H and will help S to obtain them—— e.g., "I'm sure you won't mind if. . ."; "I'm borrowing your scissors for a <u>sec--(OK?</u>")

2.4 Include both S and H in the activity ("Let's have a cookie then.")

2.5 Give, or ask for, reasons (assuming that if no good reasons not to cooperate, then H will——e.g., "Why don't we. . .".)

2.6 Assume or assert reciprocity ("If you do X for me, I'll do Y for you.")

3.0 Fulfill H's want for some X (S wants H wants <u>for</u> H, in some particular respects).

3.1 Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation; i.e., general sensitivity to what may hurt, embarrass, etc. H and attention to H's relational wants such as to be liked, admired, cared about, understood, and listened to)

3.2 Adjust language to presumed level of formality appropriate for H (e.g., "Shit!-I mean, shoot.")

C.4.0 Demonstrate regard for H's conversational rights and privileges

C.4.1 When topic juncture is ambiguous, be tentative (e.g., hesitate; "uh. . .")

C.4.2 When begin speaking simultaneously, allow H to continue.

D.5.0 Demonstrate regard for H's positive face by raising status of H vis-a-vis S (e.g., lowering worth of accomplishments, goods, etc., or appeal to luck if S compares too favorably with H)

NEGATIVE POLITENESS

4.0 Be Direct (Inherent clash between desire to be direct and desire not to coerce)

4.1 Be conventionally indirect (potentially ambiguous utterances which lose ambiguity by virtue of conventionality— indirect speech acts)

5.0 Don't presume/assume (keeping ritual distance from H by not assuming to know needs, wants, etc.)

5.1 Question, hedge ("To ask someone to do something is to presuppose that they can and are willing to do it, and have not already done it; to promise to do something is to admit that one hasn't already done it, to assume that the addressee wants it done and would prefer you to do it. . . . Consequently, to hedge these assumptions—that is, to avoid commitment to them—is a primary and fundamental method of disarming routine interactional threats." (p. 151) —Hedges can appear in a number of surface forms)

5.11 hedges on illocutionary force (don't assume H is able, willing, or obligated to do X, believe X, or accept X.

5.12 Prosodic and kinesic hedges (pitch, gesture, expression, prosidy, self-directed laughter, etc.)

6.0 Don't coerce H ——give options of willingness and/or abiltity.

6.1 Be pessimistic (express doubt that conditions of appropriateness of S's speech act obtain—e.g., "I don't suppose". . ."any chance.")

6.2 Minimize the imposition ("I <u>just</u>. . . . "; "All I know is. . .")

6.3 Give deference —(S humbles self or S raises H; by raising the status of H, S is suggesting that H has right to refuse and S has no right to coerce)

7.0 Communicate S's want to not impinge on H

7.1 Apologize

7.11 Admit the impingement ("I'm sorry. . .")

7.12 Indicate reluctance ("I really hate to intrude. . ."; "You may be the wrong person to ask.")

7.13 Give overwhelming reasons (compelling reasons for doing the FTA)

7.14 Beg forgiveness ("Excuse me. . ."; "I'm sorry to bother you. . .")

7.2 Impersonalize S and H (any device which distances the act or the speakers such as passives, "it" constructions, "one" constructions, avoiding "I", and point of view distancing)

7.25 avoiding "you"

7.3 State the FTA as a general rule ("Passengers will refrain from X. . .")

7.4 Nominalize (noun phrases——e.g., "You performed well" vs. "Your performing well" vs. "Your good performance")

8.0 Redress other wants of H's, specifically the desire to have power or status over S

8.1 Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H (<u>requests</u>: "I'll be eternally grateful"—<u>offers</u>: "It wouldn't be any trouble")

OFF RECORD

9.0 Invite conversational implicatures (violate conversational maxim in hopes that other will seek reason why and discern request or other FTA)

9.1 Give hints ("It's cold in here.")

9.2 Give association clues ("I've got a headache again." ——just more remote hints of practical--reasoning premises; need special knowledge to decode them)

9.3 Presuppose violate relevance maxim through presupposition ("At least I don't go around boasting about my accomplishments.")

9.4 Understate

9.5 Overstate

9.6 Use tautologies

9.7 Use contradictions

9.8 Be ironic

9.9 Use metaphor

9.10 Use rhetorical questions

10.0 Be vague or ambiguous: Violate the Manner Maxim

10.1 Be ambiguous

10.2 Be vague

10.3 Overgeneralize

10.4 Displace H (requesting of another so target hears but can refuse)

10.5 Be incomplete; use ellipsis

APPENDIX B

Politeness Substrategies: Absolute Frequencies

POS POLITE	MIXED MALE FRIEND	MIXED MALE STRNGR	SAME MALE FRIEND	SAME MALE STRNGR	MIXED FEMALE FRIEND	MIXED FEMALE STRNGR	SAME FEMALE FRIEND	SAME FEMALE STRNGR
1.0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
1.1	20	21	36	42	16	26	35	43
1.2	1	3	15	5	13	8	17	20
1.3	1	6	5	3	4	1	2	7
1.31	6	2	1	1	4	0	0	3
1.32	11	5	0	0	8	0	2	13
1.33	14	9	19	3	16	6	7	5
1.34	14	5	22	5	8	0	12	2
1.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.42	1	5	2	8	2	0	1	0
1.43	34	27	24	20	5	8	13	10
1.44	7	19	8	19	3	2	8	3
1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.51	2	0	1	3	0	3	1	8
1.52	4	0	1	7	0	0	7	3
1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.61	1	0	3	3	1	1	10	2
1.611	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
1.62	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
1.63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.64	32	24	26	22	25	10	40	28
1.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.721	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
1.722	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
1.723	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1
1.724	4	4	11	1	4	1	18	12
1.73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.731	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	1
1.732	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	1
1.733	0	0	1	0	0	0	9	0
1.734	24	8	19	18	9	0	10	1
1.8	0	7	5	6	0	0	3	3
subttl	178	146	201	173	118	67	204	169

POS POLITE	MIXED MALE FRIEND	MIXED MALE STRNGR	SAME MALE FRIEND	SAME MALE STRNGR	MIXED FEMALE FRIEND	MIXED FEMALE STRNGR	SAME FEMALE FRIEND	SAME FEMALE STRNGR
2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
2.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.4	0	0	5	1	0	4	0	1
2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
subttl	0	0	5	5	0	4	0	1
3.0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3.1	1	1	0	1	0	3	0	2
3.2	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0
subttl	2	2	0	1	1	5	0	2
C.4.0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
C.4.1	0	0	2	5	2	0	0	1
C.4.2	4	2	2	2	0	1	0	3
subttl	4	3	4	7	2	2	0	4
D.5.0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	1
subttl	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	1
TTL POS	184	153	211	186	121	79	204	177

	MIXED MALE FRIEND	MIXED MALE STRNGR	SAME MALE FRIEND	SAME MALE STRNGR	MIXED FEMALE FRIEND	MIXED FEMALE STRNGR	SAME FEMALE FRIEND	SAME FEMALE STRNGR
NEGATIVE POLITE								
4.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
subttl	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
5.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5.1	0	0	0	0	5	0	2	0
5.11	6	0	5	14	2	3	13	4
5.12	1	3	3	1	10	3	6	5
subttl	7	3	8	15	17	6	21	9
6.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6.1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
6.2	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	2
6.3	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0
subttl	0	0	1	3	3	0	3	2
7.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.2	0	0	6	6	1	0	1	0
7.21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
subtt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
subttl	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TTL NEG	7	3	9	18	20	6	29	11
GRD TTL NEG & POS	191	156	220	204	141	85	233	188

	MIXED MALE FRIEND	MIXED MALE STRNGR	SAME MALE FRIEND	SAME MALE STRNGR	MIXED FEMALE FRIEND	MIXED FEMALE STRNGR	SAME FEMALE FRIEND	SAME FEMALE STRNGR
OFF-RECORD								
9.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	3
9.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
subttl	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	4
10.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
subttl	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
TTL OFF-RECORD	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	4
TTL UTTER PER CONVER:	178	201	256	246	140	77	123	290